

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

**[0003]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-21, 24-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-49 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 17-19 and 33. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 22 and 23. New claims added herein are 45-49.

### **Statement of Substance of Interview**

**[0004]** The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on March 3, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

**[0005]** During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

**[0006]** The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to distinguish over the cited art of record. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

**[0007]** Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

#### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0008]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0009]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

#### **Claim Amendments and Additions**

**[0010]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 21, 17-19 and 33

herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

**[0011]** Claim 17 is amended to include subject matter that clarifies that the synchronization module is utilized to remove an identified credential from a first and second separate cache associated with respective client devices. Support for the amendments to claim 17 is found in the specification at least at paragraph [0047].

**[0012]** Furthermore, Applicant adds new claims 45-49 herein, which are directed towards specific event notifications. These new claims are fully supported by Application and therefore do not constitute new matter.

**[0013]** New claims 45-49 are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable over the cited art of record. Additionally these claims claim subject matter not disclosed or suggested by the cited art of record.

## **Formal Matters**

**[0014]** This section addresses any formal matters (e.g., objections) raised by the Examiner.

### **Claims**

**[0015]** The Examiner objects to claims 18-19 for reciting the term "the computer program product of claim 17". Herein, Applicant amends these claims, as shown above, to address the objection made by the Examiner, and to expedite prosecution.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under §103**

**[0016]** Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0171872) in view of Brovick et al. ("Windows ® 200 Active Directory <sup>TM</sup>").

**[0017]** Claims 3 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch and Brovick in light of Yianilos et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029214).

**[0018]** In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview,

Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[0019] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met for each claim as presently amended.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0020] Applicant submits that combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving an event notification, wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; and an unlock event;"

[0021] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 2) the following with regard to this claim:

The applicant argues that neither Burch nor Brovick teach or suggest that the event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; or a policy application event. The examiner does not find the argument persuasive. The examiner has previously pointed to paragraph 0046 of Burch, which clearly shows that according to a synchronization policy, upon a change to the principal credential store, the enterprise credential store is automatically updated. This falls within the scope of “a policy application event”. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

**[0022]** The further indicates (Action, p. 4) the following with regard to this claim:

Regarding claim 1, Burch disclosed a method comprising: receiving an event notification (See Burch Paragraph 0043), wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a session event, a logon event, a logout event, a lock event, an unlock event, a timer event, a policy application event, and a credential update event (See Burch Paragraph 0046); and synchronizing the local credentials and remote credentials (See Burch Paragraph 0043-0044), but Burch failed to specifically disclose enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to the event notification. Burch did, however, disclose that the credential stores are directories (See Burch Paragraph 0022).

**[0023]** Burch, paragraph [0046] states:

[0046] Conversely, some new or modified identity information can be inserted or changed by the principal within the principal credential store, at 123, and according to the synchronization policy automatically communicated to the identity service and updated to

the enterprise credential store. An update to the enterprise credential store will force the identity service to update the effected records in the appropriate identity stores.

**[0024]** As can be seen from reading the cited section of Burch, the cited art fails to disclose a event notification comprising of “a logon event”, “a logout event”, “a lock event”, or “an unlock event” as presently claimed in independent claim 1. As such, the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

### **Dependent Claims 2-16**

**[0025]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Independent Claim 17**

**[0026]** Applicant submits that combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving an event notification, wherein the event notification comprises a logon event;”

- “removing at least one of the local credentials from a first local credential cache, wherein the credential removed from the first local credential cache is identified and tagged by the synchronization module in a remote credential cache; and”
- “removing the tagged credential from a second local credential cache without rewriting the tagged credential to the remote credential cache.”

**[0027]** The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8, in rejecting claims 7-8 and 22-23)) the following with regard to this claim:

Regarding claims 7-8 and 22-23, while Burch and Brovick taught that changes in local credentials are duplicated in the remote credential store, and vice versa, they failed to specifically disclose deleting remote credentials. However, addition and deletion of credentials in a credential store is well known, and would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to have allowed flexibility in the authorizations granted within the system by allowing authorizations to be granted and taken away.

**[0028]** Applicant appreciates the Examiner acknowledging that the cited art fails to teach deleting remote credentials. Applicant has further amended these claim elements to further distinguish over the cited art. Namely, Applicant has amended these claim elements to clarify that it is the synchronization module that identifies and tags the credential from the remote credential cache. Additionally these claim elements have been amended to clarify further that it is the synchronization module that insures that the tagged credential is removed from the second local cache while insuring that the credential is not added back



to the remote credential cache. As the cited art does not teach deleting the files from a remote cache, it clearly cannot teach or suggest the specific mechanism now claimed by independent claim 17.

[0029] As shown above, the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

**Dependent Claims 18-21, 24-27, 29, 31-32 and 45-49**

[0030] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

**Independent Claim 33**

[0031] Applicant submits that combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “a synchronizing module operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler receives an event notification and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another, wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; and an unlock event;”

**[0032]** As can be seen from reading the cited section of Burch, the cited art fails to disclose a event notification comprising of “a logon event”, “a logout event”, “a lock event”, or “an unlock event” as presently claimed in independent claim 33. As such, the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

**Dependent Claims 35-44**

**[0033]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

## **Conclusion**

[0034] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/

Dated: 2009-06-04

Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; x4715)

Registration No. 59090

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com